

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/400,974	09/22/1999	HIROYA SATO	0033-0619P-S	4024
75	90 05/05/2004		EXAM	INER
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH LLP			LE, LANA N	
P O BOX 747 FALLS CHURG	CH, VA 220400747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
25 0			2685	2
			DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/400,974	SATO ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lana Le	2685	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 06 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate e unt of the fee. The appropriate e originally set in the final Office ac	PEP extension extension ction; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifyin	ig the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3.igtimes Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): <u>USC 112 rejections</u> .		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amend	lment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: see		dered but does NOT place	the the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	<i>'</i>
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-40</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appli	roved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer			
10. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del> -	



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Regarding claims 1, 11, 15, and 18, applicant states the cited reference, Fortune et al, does not teach a "main lobe and a side lobe". However, as is pointed out in the final office action, applicant's specification discloses the main and side lobe of the antenna receive the direct and indirect signals, respectively. The indirect and direct signals of the reference is described in the reflection path loss and direct path loss calculation after receiving the reflected (indirect) and direct signals respectively. Also, applicant alleges tha the predicted calculation assumes the antenna is a dipole, the predicted and the measured value follow the same trend and the actual measured transmitted and received signal does use a dipole antenna (col 9,lines 29- col 10, line 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art if not inherent to realize that the antenna of Fortune et al could contain the specific structure of a main lobe and a side lobe as is notoriously well known in the structure of virtually all antennas to some extent, in order to be capable of receiving the simultaneous reflected (indirect) and direct signals as an intended use via the side and main lobe respectively at the "receiver point 212". Second, applicant alleges that the cited prior art, Fortune et al, does not disclose a stationary receiver. However, th claim language merely states broadly "a stationary transmitter and receiver". Also, the actual measured single receiver point could represent the position of the portable device when it is stationary in order to calculate the reflected and direct path loss at which the portable device properly operates when stationary at that point. In addition, the portable device when when motionless is a "stationary receiver" in the same way the receiver 2, placed on the TV, of applicant's figure 1 is stationary while motionless. Furthermore, when the actual measurement is made, the receiver and transmitter point could represent the position of any device, without the necessity of being stationary or mobile, ie. a printer, fax, etc. with the receiver and transmitter being part of or attached to the device, being positioned at those points to calculate the reflected and direct propagation loss. Applicant request for the 112 rejection due to millimeter wave be withdrawn due to it not being unclearly claimed therefore the 112 rejection due to millimeter is dropped, however, millimeter is a notoriously old and well known term in the art. The 112 rejection due to simultaneous reception will be withdrawn, however, the cited reference still reads on the broadest interpretation of the claimed invention of simultaneous reception.

EDWARD F. URBAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT LECTROLIC

TECHNOLOGY CENVER LUID